



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/734,658

12/11/2003

W. Daniel Hillis

SE1-0002C3-US

9013

80118

7590

12/18/2009

Constellation Law Group, PLLC

P.O. Box 220

Tracyton, WA 98393

EXAMINER

SAVLA, ARPAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2185

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/18/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/734,658</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> HILLIS ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> Arpan P. Savla</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2185</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☒ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-50.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Sanjiv Shah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2185

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments change the scope of claims 3 and 28, thus raising new issues that would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to Applicant's argument regarding Miller's teaching of "the schedule identifying the content by one or more times" in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Miller disclose the scheduler distributes distribution schedules along with transmission instructions (that include the time to start transmitting the content data) to the replicated servers. Therefore, it follows that Miller sufficiently discloses the schedule (i.e. distribution schedule) identifying the content (i.e. content data) by one or more times (i.e. transmission times).

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding Miller's teaching of "printing the schedule of transmission on a medium" in claim 2, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. When taking the broadest reasonable interpretations of the terms "printing" and "medium", the act of "transmitting" the "distribution schedule" across the "communication links" anticipates the act of "printing the schedule of content transmission on a medium" because the distribution schedule is reproduced ("printed") on the communication link ("medium"). Therefore, it follows that Miller sufficiently discloses printing (i.e. reproducing) the schedule of transmission (i.e. distribution schedule) on a medium (i.e. communication link).

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding claim 3, the Examiner directs Applicant above to the "Continuation of 3" section of this action.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding claim 26, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs Applicant above to the response regarding claim 1.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding claim 27, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs Applicant above to the response regarding claim 2.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding claim 28, the Examiner directs Applicant above to the "Continuation of 3" section of this action.

As for Applicant's arguments with respect to the dependent claims, the arguments rely on the allegation that the independent claims are patentable and therefore for the same reasons the dependent claims are patentable. However, as addressed above, the independent claims are not patentable, thus, Applicant's arguments with respect to the dependent claims are not persuasive.